

26. The system of claim 24, further comprising a non-display device coupled to the communications channel to receive non-video data.

27. The system of claim 24, wherein the first and second address decoders each decode a broadcast address in a broadcast message to be processed by the first and second display devices.

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 18, 21-22 and 24-27 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,349 ("Molloy"). Claims 15-17 and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molloy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,155 ("Arai"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the amended claims because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Independent claims 1 and 22 each recite several elements that are not disclosed or suggested by Molloy, and the lack of any one of these elements in Molloy is sufficient to allow claims 1 and 22 over the cited reference. These elements are:

- 1) Molloy does not disclose or suggest multiple display devices on a common communications channel. Nor does Molloy disclose or suggest any means by which multiple display devices might be incorporated into his single-display design.

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

- 2) Molloy does not disclose or suggest that only those portions of a video image that have changed will be communicated over the communications channel. Molloy updates specific areas of a display, but the selection of these areas is based on user choice and not on whether the contents of the image have changed.
- 3) Molloy only addresses how an image is to be displayed (a selected portion of the image is to be displayed with a different resolution than the rest). The claimed invention addresses how the video image data is transferred to the display device, rather than how that video image is to be displayed. Although both Molloy and Applicant seek to reduce the amount of transferred data, their respective approaches to achieving that goal are significantly different. The common goal is not claimed, nor is it relevant.

In explaining the rejection, the Office Action states that Molloy teaches the following:

- 1) A system with improved display video images,
- 2) A focus coordinates transmitter,
- 3) Execution of software,
- 4) Video changes that appear continuous,
- 5) A second processor, executing software in a second memory,
- 6) Using a processor to update a video memory,
- 7) Accessibility of video games.

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

None of these features is claimed. The explanations contained in the rejections of other claims also includes discussions of elements that are not claimed. If unclaimed elements are to be included in a rejection, Applicant respectfully requests an explanation of how the inclusion of these unclaimed elements helps to explain the manner in which the cited reference might disclose or suggest the claimed elements.

Claims 2-5, 8-13 depend from claim 1, while claims 15-21, 24-27 depend from claim 22, and thus contain the same limitations not disclosed by Molloy.

In addition to being allowable due to their dependency from claims 1 and 22, the following dependent claims contain additional allowable subject matter as described below:

Claims 3 and 4 recite sending the portional video data over the communications channel at regular (claim 3) and irregular (claim 4) intervals, respectively. Of the two cited portions of Molloy that were applied to claims 3 and 4 in the rejection, column 1 lines 32-36 only discusses overall data bandwidth, while column 6 lines 16-18 only discusses who sets the frequency of updates. Neither addresses whether the updates occur at regular or irregular intervals.

Claim 5 recites that the irregular intervals of claim 4 are based on detecting whether a change in the video image has occurred. Since Molloy never addresses changes in the video image, he cannot address the detection of such changes.

Claims 10 and 11 recite that the updates for the two display devices are formatted differently (claim 10) and alike (claim 11). Molloy does not disclose any details for

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

formatting the data. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 10 (column 6 lines 16-18) is devoted to a discussion of the frequency of the updates, not their format.

Claims 12 and 24 recite using different addresses for the two display devices. Molloy does not disclose anything related to device addresses. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 12 (column 10 lines 11-17) is devoted to a discussion of video receiver 36 that acts as a communications interface for Molloy's only display device 14. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 24 (column 4 lines 7-10) is devoted to a discussion of types of communications channels. Since Molloy does not need addressable devices, Molloy contains no motivation to use addressable devices, and understandably does not discuss the use of addresses at all.

Claim 13 recites time-stamping (i.e., including time-identification information) two separate portions of video data so their presentation in the display device may be synchronized based on the time-stamps. Molloy does not disclose anything related to time-stamping the video data. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 13 (column 8 lines 34-39) is devoted to a discussion of eliminating lower-priority updates, not of synchronizing the display of both updates based on time-stamp data within the updates.

Claim 15 recites a protocol handler to interpret the video data. The Office action admits that Molloy does not disclose this limitation and cites column 5 lines 49-51 of Arai to provide the limitation missing from Molloy. However, this portion of Arai only discusses the interpretation of a command, not of data protocol. As is well known in the art, data protocol involves how different pieces of data are to be used based on their

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

position with the overall data structure, not on interpreting a single command embedded within that data.

Claim 25 recites the use of different protocols in the video data sent to the two different display devices. Since Molloy does not disclose the use of multiple display devices, Molloy cannot disclose the use of different protocols for each different display device. Further, as previously stated, neither Molloy nor Arai discuss the use of protocols in the data at all. The portion of Arai cited in the rejection (column 4 lines 7-10 is devoted to a discussion of the different types of communications channels, not to a discussion of different data protocols.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 8-13, 15-22, 24-27 are now in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this amendment. If this is incorrect, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOLOKOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 10-1-02

John Travis
John Travis
Reg. No. 43,203

12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(512) 330-0844

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

APPENDIX A**Marked-Up Copy of Amended Claims**

1. (Amended twice) A method of displaying an image, comprising:
transmitting a first portion of first video image data, without transmitting a remaining portion of the first video image data, over a communications channel to a first display device having a first video memory [in a first display device];
transmitting a second portion of second video image data, without transmitting a remaining portion of the second video image data, over the communications channel to a second display device having a second video memory [in a second display device];
updating the first video memory with the first portion;
updating the second video memory with the second portion;
wherein the first portion contains video data representing a part of the first video image data that has changed since a previous transmission to the first display device, and excludes a substantial part of the first video image data that is unchanged since the previous transmission to the first display device;
wherein the second portion contains video data representing a part of the second video image data that has changed since a previous transmission to the second display device, and excludes a substantial part of the second video

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

image data that is unchanged since the previous transmission to the second
video display device.